

From: [Cogliano, Vincent](#)
To: [Hawkins, CherylA](#)
Subject: RE: allegation #100
Date: Thursday, August 9, 2018 10:30:52 AM

Thank you, Cheryl. Agreed—Vince

From: Hawkins, CherylA
Sent: Thursday, 9 August, 2018 10:00
To: Cogliano, Vincent <cogliano.vincent@epa.gov>
Subject: FW: allegation #100

Hi Vince,

Below is an email I sent regarding allegation #100. I think to close out the allegation, you would simply need to reply that you agree with my assessment and then I will add it to the file.

Cheryl A. Hawkins, Ph.D.
US EPA/ORD/Office of the Science Advisor
RRB 41259
(202)564-7307
hawkins.cheryla@epa.gov

From: Hawkins, CherylA
Sent: Friday, January 12, 2018 3:23 PM
To: Cogliano, Vincent <cogliano.vincent@epa.gov>
Subject: allegation #100

Hi Vince,

I reviewed the materials for allegation #100.

The allegator was a (b) (6) of the (b) (6) when he submitted the allegation, but appears to have since left the Agency.

The allegation contends, “. . . the PRG (Preliminary Remediation Goals) for radionuclides developed by (b) (6) is: not scientifically defensible, gives the wrong technical answers, and risks the Agency making ill-informed decision which will either not be protective or an underestimate of remedial/removal costs.” Further, he states, “Our recommended/suggested outcome of your investigation would be that the use of the PRG for radionuclides be suspended indefinitely and replaced with RESRAD until such time as the PRG can be made a scientific tool or completely set aside.” RESRAD is a DOE product.

The allegation is a differing scientific opinion between (b) (6) and (b) (6). The allegator did not provide any assertion that his opinion was being suppressed in anyway. Since he was a manager at

(b) (6) and indicated in the materials he provided that he asked his staff to perform reviews of the issue in question, it seems unlikely his opinion was suppressed. Therefore, I do not see any indication that the EPA Scientific Integrity Policy was violated and the arbitration of the scientific dispute in question should be left to (b) (6) and the Region to resolve.

Since the allegator is no longer at the Agency, we do not have any contact information and it isn't known if he could possibly be working for an outside organization with self-interest in the outcome of this dispute, I recommend that we do not attempt to send a response to the allegator. Instead I recommend we simply update the status to adjudicated – dismissed.

Please let me know if you agree.

Cheryl A. Hawkins, Ph.D.
US EPA/ORD/Office of the Science Advisor
RRB 41259
(202)564-7307
hawkins.cheryla@epa.gov